

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference PHCN030039WO	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/IB2004/052276	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 03 November 2004 (03.11.2004)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 10 November 2003 (10.11.2003)
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V.		

1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).

2. This REPORT consists of a total of 7 sheets, including this cover sheet.

In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland Facsimile No. +41 22 740 14 35	Date of issuance of this report 15 May 2006 (15.05.2006) Authorized officer <div style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold; font-size: 1.2em;">Cecile Chatel</div> Telephone No. +41 22 338 70 60
---	--

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

REC'D 11 FEB 2005

WIPO PCT

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/B2004/052276

International filing date (day/month/year)
03.11.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)
10.11.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
H04Q7/38, H04L12/28

Applicant
KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☒ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Mele, M

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7994



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2004/052276

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2004/052276

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-20
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	1-20
	No: Claims	
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-20
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

see separate sheet

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: US 2003/13 46 36 A

D2: WO 03/09 22 18 A1

1. The present application meets the requirements of **Articles 33(1)-(4) PCT**, because the subject-matter of **Claim 1** is novel and involves an inventive step for the following reasons.

Document **D1**, which is considered to represent the most relevant state of the art, discloses, according to the essential features of **Claim 1** (applying the terminology of present **Claim 1** and the references to **D1**), a communication method performed by a WWAN network system for a mobile terminal with a WWAN address in the WWAN to handover between the WWAN and a WLAN (paragraph [0080]), comprising the steps of:

- receiving a registration report (paragraphs [0080], [0081]);

The subject-matter of **Claim 1** differs from the disclosure of **D1** in the fact that it claims:

- receiving a registration report **sent by the mobile terminal when it enters the WLAN, wherein the registration report at least contains a WLAN address that the mobile terminal acquires when entering the WLAN; and**
- **establishing mapping relationship between the WWAN address and the WLAN address of the mobile terminal.**

The subject-matter of **Claim 1** is therefore novel (**Article 33(2) PCT**).

Document **D1** only discloses a WWAN to WLAN handover procedure, however it is silent

about sending from the mobile terminal a registration report comprising the WLAN address acquired by the mobile terminal when entering the WLAN area.

Although **D2** (disclosing an interworking method for maintaining the authentication of a mobile terminal across two different network) discloses to transmit a registration message to the authentication server of the WLAN comprising the IP address of the mobile terminal, it is silent about handover from WWAN to WLAN. Therefore, a skilled person would arrive at the claimed subject-matter of **Claim 1** neither with the disclosure of **D1** or **D2** taken alone nor combined.

The subject-matter of **Claim 1** therefore involves an inventive step (**Article 33(2) PCT**).

2. The same considerations made in respect of **Claim 1** are also valid for independent **Claims 7, 12 and 17**, which contain the corresponding feature combination as **Claim 1** in terms of claims relating to respectively a method performed by a mobile terminal, a WWAN network system and a mobile terminal.

Therefore the subject-matter of **Claims 7, 12 and 17** is novel and involves an inventive step and thus, they satisfy the criterion set forth in **Articles 33(2) and 33(3) PCT**.

3. **Claims 2 to 6, 8 to 11, 13 to 16 and 18 to 20** are dependent on **Claims 1, 7, 12 and 17** respectively and as such also meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step (**Articles 33(2) and 33(3) PCT**).

Re Item VIII

Certain observations on the international application (clarity)

4. The formulation of the present **Claims 12 and 6** requires a revision, in order to avoid any doubts as to the category of these claims (PCT Guidelines 5.37). In this respect, some features are formulated in terms which rather correspond to features of a method (e.g. expressions such as "unit unpacks...to get the data", "...so as to send...", etc.) while the claims are generally directed to an apparatus (or system); a reformulation in terms of features clearly falling in the apparatus category is hence necessary (e.g. "unpacking unit adapted to retrieve data information from the source address of the received data",

"...sending unit adapted to send the data information...").

Re Item VII.

Certain defects in the International Application

5. The attention of the Applicant is drawn to the further deficiencies:

- 5.1 Independent **Claims 1, 7, 12, and 17** have not been drafted in the two-part form, as recommended by **Rule 6.3(b) PCT**.
- 5.2 The features of the preambles of the claims have not been provided with reference signs placed in parentheses (**Rule 6.2(b) PCT**).
- 5.3 In order to meet the requirements of **Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT**, the cited document **D1 and D2** should have been acknowledged and briefly discussed in the opening part of the description.
- 5.4 The vague and imprecise statement in the description on page 18, line 18 implies that the subject-matter for which protection is sought may be different to that defined by the claims, thereby resulting in lack of clarity (**Article 6 PCT**) when used to interpret them (see also the **PCT Guidelines, 5.30**).

Therefore, the expression "spirit and" should have been deleted to remove this inconsistency.